| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|---|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | 10/532,331 | BOLLBUCK ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | EBENEZER SACKEY | 1624 |
| All Participants: | Status of Application: | _ |
| (1) <u>EBENEZER SACKEY</u> . | (3) | |
| (2) <u>MARK MILSTEAD</u> . | (4) | |
| Date of Interview: 18 May 2009 | Time: | |
| Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes If Yes, provide a brief description: ☐ Applicant's representative) | | |
| Part I. | | |
| Rejection(s) discussed: NONE | | |
| Claims discussed: all pending claims | | |
| Prior art documents discussed: None | | |
| Part II. | | |
| SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: The Examiner pointed out to applicants attorney, Mark Milstead, that there were a few typographical errors in the claims that need to be corrected for the case to be allowed. Thus, a supplemental amendment will be filed by applicants. | | |
| Part III. | | |
| ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. | | |
| /E, S./ Examiner, Art Unit 1624 (A | pplicant/Applicant's Representat | ive Signature – if appropriate) |